

**REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office action electronically delivered on December 3, 2007. Applicants hereby respectfully request entry of the amendments to claims 1 and 7 as set forth hereinbefore to place the present application in proper condition for allowance. No new matter has been added to the claims by virtue of the present amendments, and reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 1-2 and 4-15 are earnestly requested.

**Present Status of the Application**

Applicants have noted that the previous arguments with respect to claims 1-2 and 4-15 were considered but deemed moot in view of the new grounds of rejections, and thus this action is made final.

Specifically, claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-9, and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsuzuki (USPN 5,745,093, hereinafter "Tsuzuki"). Claim 6 remains rejected under U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuzuki in view of Applicants' admitted prior art (hereinafter "AAPA"). In addition, claims 10-12 stay rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuzuki.

After carefully considering the remarks set forth in this Office action and the cited reference, Applicants guard against the prior art rejections by amending claims 1 and 7 to more explicitly describe the claimed invention and patently define the boundaries of the present invention over the prior art of record. Supporting grounds are provided in the drawings and the disclosure of the Applicants' invention, and therefore it is

submitted that no new matter has been introduced to the application by the amendments made to the claims. In order to have the proposed amendments considered, Applicants hereby file a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and submit the Preliminary Amendment along with said Request. Reconsideration of the application is courteously solicited.

**Discussion of the 35 U.S.C § 102 Rejections**

*Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-9, and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsuzuki.*

Anticipation under § 102 requires “the presence in a single prior art disclosure of all elements of a claimed invention arranged as in that claim.” *Carella v. Starlight Archery & Pro Line Co.*, 804 F. 2d 135, 138, 231 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 644, 646 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (quoting *Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.*, 774 F.2d 1082, 1101, 227 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 337, 350, (Fed. Cir. 1985)) (additional citations omitted).

As described hereinafter, Applicants respectfully submit that Tsuzuki is legally deficient in anticipating claims 1 and 7 because Tsuzuki fails to disclose each and every element of the claims under consideration.

With respect to Applicants’ claim 1, as currently amended, it recites in parts,

“A liquid crystal panel, comprising:

...

a column driver, receiving a pixel data including sub-pixel data XT, YT, and ZT

at period  $T$ , having  $J \times M$  data lines coupled to said display area for cooperating with said row driver to complete driving  $M$  pixels on a same row in said display area after said row driver scans  $I$  times, wherein  $T$  is a integer,  $I \times J = K$ ,  $1 < I$ ,  $J < K$ , and said column driver includes:

an even column driver receiving a portion of the pixel data for driving an even portion of said  $J \times M$  data lines in said display area, wherein the even column driver receives the sub-pixel data  $X_T$  and  $Z_T$  when the period  $T = 4s$ , receives the sub-pixel data  $Y_T$  and  $Z_T$  when the period  $T = 4s + 1$ , receives the sub-pixel data  $Y_T$  when the period  $T = 4s + 2$ , and receives the sub-pixel data  $X_T$  when the period  $T = 4s + 3$ ,  $s$  being a integer; and

an odd column driver receiving a portion of the pixel data for driving an odd portion of said  $J \times M$  data lines in said display area, wherein the odd column driver receives the sub-pixel data  $Y_T$  when the period  $T = 4s$ , receives the sub-pixel data  $X_T$  when the period  $T = 4s + 1$ , receives the sub-pixel data  $X_T$  and  $Z_T$  when the period  $T = 4s + 2$ , and receives the sub-pixel data  $Y_T$  and  $Z_T$  when the period  $T = 4s + 3$ , **the odd column driver and the even column driver being disposed at opposite sides of the display area.** (Emphasis added)

Independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that Tsuzuki does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature that is recited in bold print in the afore-referenced claim 1. More specifically, in the currently amended claim 1, the column driver comprises an even column driver and an odd column driver respectively **disposed at the opposite sides of the display area.**

With reference to the disclosure of Tsuzuki, the first sample-hold means of the liquid crystal display driving system is set for holding first video signals for pixels corresponding to only odd rows on a first side of the screen and for supplying the first held video signals to data lines corresponding to the first side of the screen based on the first output directing signal, while a third sample-hold means is set for holding third video signals for pixels corresponding to only odd rows on a second side of the screen and for supplying the third held video signals to data lines corresponding to the second side of the screen based on the third output directing signal. Here, the first side and the second side of the screen are actually referred to as “the first half side of the screen” (e.g., the left side of the liquid crystal cell) and “the second half side of the screen” (e.g., the right side of the liquid crystal cell). As illustrated in FIGs. 4, 6, and 11 of the Tsuzuki reference, the left side of the liquid crystal cell is driven by the first and the second output enable signals OE1 and OE2, whereas the right side of the liquid crystal cell is driven by the third and the fourth output enable signals OE3 and OE4. In other words, all of the sample-hold means (purportedly equivalent to the column drivers of the present invention) are disposed at the same side (the upper side) of the display area, and the RGB video signals are input to the data driver in series.

By contrast, the even column driver and the odd column driver of the present invention are disposed at opposite sides of the display area as set forth in the amended claim 1 of the current application, such that the video signals (R, G, B) are input to the even column driver and the odd column driver in parallel, as depicted in FIG. 5 of the instant case.

Since the feature “the odd column driver and the even column driver being disposed at opposite sides of the display area” provided in claim 1 at issue has neither been explicitly taught nor been implicitly suggested by Tsuzuki, novelty and non-obviousness of Applicants’ claim 1 should be affirmed.

If independent claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record, then its dependent claims 2 and 4-5 are allowable as a matter of law because these dependent claims contain all features of their independent claim 1. *In re Fine*. 837, F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Likewise, claim 7 has been amended in the same way as proposed to Applicants’ claim 1, and thus claim 7 at issue should be novel, non-obvious, and allowable because of Tsuzuki’s failure to expressly teach or inherently suggest the feature “the odd column driver and the even column driver are disposed at opposite sides of the display area” claimed in Applicants’ claim 7.

If independent claim 7 is allowable over the prior art of record, then its dependent claims 8-9 and 13-15 are allowable as a matter of law because the dependent claims contains all features of their independent claim 7. *In re Fine*. 837, F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Based on the above, Tsuzuki neither anticipates claims 1 and 7 nor anticipates claims 2, 4-5, 8-9, and 13-15 respectively depending thereupon. Thus, the 102 rejections of the aforesaid claims should be withdrawn.

**Discussion of the 35 U.S.C § 103 Rejections**

*Claim 6 remains rejected under U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuzuki in view of AAPA. In addition, claims 10-12 stay rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuzuki.*

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be **some suggestion or motivation**, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be **a reasonable expectation of success**. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) **must teach or suggest all the claim limitations**. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. See M.P.E.P. § 2143.

In response to the obviousness type of rejections, it is respectfully submitted that Tsuzuki fails to expressly teach or inherently suggest at least the feature **“the odd column driver and the even column driver being disposed at opposite sides of the display area”** claimed in Applicants' claims 1 and 7 as discussed hereinbefore. Since AAPA also fails to disclose the missing feature, the Tsuzuki reference, AAPA, or any other references of record, either taken alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest said novel feature, rendering Applicants' claims 1 and 7 non-obvious and patentable.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully present that independent claims 1 and 7 patently define over the prior art references. Since claims 6 and 10-12 are dependent claims which further define the invention respectively recited in claims 1 and 7, as a matter of law these dependent claims are also in condition for

allowance. *In re Fine*, 837, F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

After the above amendments and remarks are taken into account, the Examiner's kind reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the presently pending claims 1-2 and 4-15 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date :

Feb. 26, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jiang Chyun Intellectual Property Office  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor-1, No. 100  
Roosevelt Road, Section 2  
Taipei, 100, Taiwan  
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800  
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233  
Email: [belinda@jciigroup.com.tw](mailto:belinda@jciigroup.com.tw)  
[Usa@jciigroup.com.tw](mailto:Usa@jciigroup.com.tw)